

APPLICATION NO.

10/772,307

SUITE 1600

CANADA

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3

1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	. CONFIRMATION NO
6013-145US	6477
EXA	MINER
WEIER,	ANTHONY J
ART UNIT	. PAPER NUMBER
1794	

DELIVERY MODE

PAPER

MAIL DATE

10/04/2007

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR

Laurent Bazinet

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

FILING DATE

02/06/2004

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/772,307	BAZINET ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anthony Weier	1761	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a rep will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH . cause the application to become ABAI	ATION. by be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this communication. SOURCE (35 U.S.C. & 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	 action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar		s, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b)□ objected to by	the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).	
 Certified copies of the priority documents 	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		eceived in this National Stage /	
application from the International Bureau	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not re	ceived.	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	∧□	(070 440)	
Notice of References Cited (P10-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT0-948)	4) Ll Interview Sur Paper No(s)/l	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date	
3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice of Info	rmal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/772,307

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baraldi.

Baraldi discloses a first extraction of a plant material (carob leaf or meal)
wherein most of the EGC is removed into the extract wherein the plant material is then
extracted a second time wherein a number of remaining catechins are removed
including EGCG (see Table 1), said plant material extracted with hot water.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mishkin et al.

Mishkin et al discloses a first extraction of tea (e.g. fresh tea leaves; col. 3), wherein it is expected that due to the high temperature of the extraction solution (e.g. 110 C) and residence times employed in the instant invention (e.g. 10 minutes; col. 3; instant Specification; Example 1) most of the EGC is removed in said first extract. Mishkin et al further discloses a second extraction of the tea at a higher temperature

Art Unit: 1761

wherein it is expected due to the high temperature at least a residual amount of a second catechin (e.g. EGCG) is removed. Both extractions are conducted using water.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 6, 7, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baraldi.

The claims further call for the temperatures employed during the first and second extracts. Although Baraldi discloses the extractions being conducted with hot water (paragraph 15), there is no specific recitation of the temperature employed. However, such determination would have been well within the purview of a skilled artisan, and, absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have arrived at such temperature through routine experimentation by extracting with different hot water temperatures.

6. Claims 3, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishkin et al.

The claims further call for the temperatures employed during the first and second extracts. Although Mishkin et al discloses the first extraction being conducted at a temperature less than 110 C, there is no specific recitation of the temperatures as called

Art Unit: 1761

for in instant claims 6 and 7. However, such determination would have been well within the purview of a skilled artisan, and, absent a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have arrived at such temperature through routine experimentation by extracting with different hot water temperatures.

Although Mishkin et al discloses the treatment of fresh tea as well as black tea, it is not clear whether or not the fresh tea is green tea. However, it is well known to prepare tea beverages from all sorts of teas including green tea, and it would have been further obvious to have employed a green tea as a matter of preference depending on, for example, the desired taste of the subsequently formed tea beverage.

Prior Art

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Weier whose telephone number is 571-272-1409. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anthony Weier September 23, 1007 Anthony Weier Primary Examiner Art Unit 1761